

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed October 12, 2006. Claim 1 is amended. Claims 1-22 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicant requests that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicant's understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner's allowance of claims 8-22 is appreciated. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful review and allowance of those claims.

Applicant submits the following comments concerning the Examiner's statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the claimed invention of claims 8-22 is patentable over the prior art, but respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in Office Action. Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicant does not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement in the Office Action.

II. Prior Art Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Pusateri et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,008, 995) in view of *Henschen* (U.S. Patent No. 3,533,045). Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection for obviousness on the grounds that the references—either individually or in combination—fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims.

As amended, independent claim 1 specifically requires that the card portion of the functional module be supported within a card cage along its two side edges, as well as along at least half the length of the card. As correctly observed by the Examiner, *Pusateri* fails to disclose the claimed card support in combination with every other element of claim 1. *See* Office Action, page 5. Moreover, *Henschen* fails to correct this deficiency. Indeed, *Henschen* merely teaches the presence of a “notch” 54 formed along one edge of the printed circuit board that is configured so as to engage the guide 2 portion. Nowhere does *Henschen* teach or suggest the claimed combination, wherein the card portion is supported along at least half the length of the card, as is currently required. Because neither *Pusateri* nor *Henschen* teach the apparatus being claimed in independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2-7 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as for independent claim 1, from which claims 2-7 depend.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 12th day of April, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric L. Maschoff/Reg. No. 36,596

ERIC L. MASCHOFF
Registration No. 36,596
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800